

Serial No. 10/091,491
Amdt Dated: March 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2004

Docket No. P-0339

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-6 and 9-15 have been amended and claims 20-30 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Suzuki; claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Landry; claim 9-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Tanaka et al; claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Tanaka et al. and Suzuki; and claims 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Shuichi.

Claims 1-3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Suzuki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a mobile terminal including a main body housing a circuit substrate inside and having an operational button on the front surface, a folder rotatively connected to the main body and having a liquid screen, a hinge connecting unit for rotatively connecting the main body and the folder, and a buffer member installed to a

certain portion of contact between the main body and the folder for absorbing a shock when the folder is unfolded.

As noted in the specification beginning at page 2, line 12, a shock occurs on contact portions of the folder and the main body. In more detail, as shown in Figure 1, the shock occurs when both corner portions 120 of the hinge unit 114 and the upper portion 122 of the hinge bracket 112 contact each other, and the shock occurs when the central portion 124 of the hinge unit 114 of the folder 110 and the central portion 126 of the hinge bracket 112 of the main body 102 contact each other. Further, when the user finishes using the terminal, the user rotates the folder 110 over the certain angle in the folded direction, the elastic force of the spring works in the same direction, and the folder 110 is folded.

When the folder 110 is folded, a shock occurs on the contact portion of the folder 110 and the main body 102 by the elastic force of the spring. In more detail, as shown in Figure 2, when the folder 110 is folded, the front upper portion 130 of the folder 110 and the front lower portion 132 of the main body 102 contact each other, and a shock occurs on the contact portions by the elastic force of the spring. Thus, the shock may be transmitted to an operational circuit of the main body or a liquid screen of the folder, causing damage to these components.

The present invention advantageously includes a buffer member for absorbing a shock of a contact between the main body and the folder when the folder is unfolded.

On the contrary, Suzuki merely teach a conductive material 5 and a cushion 6 connected with each other face to face for preventing an undesired radiation inside the open/closed panel 1 (see Figures 1 and 2 and column 5, lines 32-40). The conductive material 5 and the cushion 6 are not a buffer member for preventing a shock of the contact between the main body and the folder when the folder is unfolded.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom patentable define over Suzuki.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Landry has also been overcome as Landry also does not teach or suggest the claimed buffer member.

Claims 9-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Tanaka et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Similar comments apply to independent claim 9. In more detail, independent claim 9 is directed to a mobile terminal including a buffer member for absorbing a shock installed to a certain portion of a contact between a main body and a folder when the folder is folded. Figures 7 and 8 illustrate non-limiting examples of the claimed buffer member for absorbing a shock of a contact between the main body and the folder when the folder is folded. See also the corresponding description in the specification.

On the contrary, Yoshiharu teaches a buffer member 9 surrounding a hinge and a buffer member 10. However, the buffer members in Yoshiharu do not correspond with the claimed buffer member for absorbing a shock installed to a certain portion of a contact between the main body and the folder when the folder is folded.

Further, independent claim 14 includes similar features with regard to independent claims 1 and 9 discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 9 and 14 and the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Tanaka et al. and Suzuki has also been overcome as Suzuki also does not teach or suggest the claim features recited in independent claim 9.

Claims 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshiharu in view of Shuichi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 15 includes similar features to that discussed above with respect to independent claim 9. As noted above, Yoshiharu does not teach or suggest the claim buffer means. Shuichi also does not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 15 and the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

In addition, new claims 20-30 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope and Applicant submits the new claims are supported by the originally-filed application.

Serial No. 10/091,491
Amdt Dated: March 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2004

Docket No. P-0339

It is respectfully submitted the applied art does not teach or suggest the features or the combination thereof of the new claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck, Esq.
Registration No. 40,287
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:CLD:DAB/cah/knv/lew

Date: March 7, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2000\2000-315\43550.doc